



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/529,186 | 05/01/2007 | Nicolas Goujon | 14.0210-PCT-US | 4412 |
| 28116 | 7590 | 07/16/2009 | EXAMINER | |
| WesternGeco L.L.C. Jeffrey E. Griffin 10001 Richmond Avenue HOUSTON, TX 77042-4299 | | | LOBO, IAN J | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3662 | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 07/16/2009 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lgoldsmith@slb.com
aperalta2@slb.com
rsmith31@slb.com

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/529,186 | Applicant(s) GOUJON ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Ian J. Lobo | Art Unit 3662 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ian J. Lobo. (3) ____.

(2) Jeffrey Pyle. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 13 July 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 29.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lunde et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argues that the limitation of "mechanically decouple" the signal cable from the tension cable is not met by Lunde et al. It is examiner's position that the claims, as presently claimed, read upon such limitation..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|--|
| //Ian J. Lobo// Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3662 | |
|--|--|